

STAT

Washington, D.C. 20505

10/20

Executive Registry

77-2615

Any news on
whether we should
try to improve our
national posture
for research on
BRSSR
SK

P. 34 ff.

EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE NFAC

CSIS Report

U.S. Research on the USSR and Eastern Europe: A Critical Resource for Security and Commercial Policy

Gerald Sullivan
Rapporteur



Center for Strategic and International Studies
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.

ing would be supplied by the federal government, with further funding to be solicited from private sources. The institute could be funded directly by Congress in a manner analogous to that of the Woodrow Wilson Center. Alternatively, a consortium composed of representatives of the executive departments, not unlike that considered for the long-range research program, would be a possible model for this support. The former approach, while perhaps more difficult to arrange, could insure stable funding and the independence from mission orientation which are essential in order to obtain the greatest benefits from such an endeavor.

Actions for Across-the-Board Support of Foreign Area Research (See Table B, p. 29)

The first action item for foreign area research is to provide infrastructural support from federal funds for centers of advanced foreign affairs research. This is not support for specific research topics, but rather money to provide for the continued existence of these centers so they can serve the whole community of researchers and users of foreign area materials. Included within this support is payment to the home institution for faculty release-time for research, post-doctoral fellowships, funds for acquisition and servicing of specialized libraries, funds to cover costs of disseminating research materials, center support-staff salaries, and funds for unique centers such as the Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo, Universities Service Center in Hong Kong, etc. Not included are the cost of office space and utilities which would be borne by the home institution. Annual support needed for this program is estimated at \$10-15 million.

The knowledge generated and disseminated by these centers of advanced foreign affairs research directly benefits the federal government, which bears the responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs. Although education remains primarily a state, local, and private concern, this is an area of federal responsibility. It appears both logical and prudent that the federal government provide for the base support which will insure the sustainment and quality of informational studies and training.

The arguments for, and the approach to, handling of this infrastructure support have been developed by the American Council on Education, acting together with government representatives in the form of a Government/Academic Interface Committee.¹ The procedure would be for these centers to be chosen initially through competition, and subject thereafter to review for continuation at regular three-year intervals. The basic program would be monitored by an advisory committee. To insure stability, a long-term legislative solution is required. Considerations include amendment of NDEA Title VI, reauthorization and appropriation of the International Education Act (IEA), or

creation of a State. Sever Title VI wou IEA is cons reauthorizati possible, each awaits forcef

The second meaningful r foreign langu means severa work. For t relations, and nations, lang the United St only a small s ment of foreig tion in the lat national prog language tra

Annual fed national lang port for the in of new teach classical lan Arabic, and and internat troduce lang law, etc. Th appropriate, wi The significa with the curr and area stud

A third act second, is the Language Tr damental and a small segme portant segm charged with quacy, qual resources in t its findings, recommenda program prev native to the

her funding
be funded
e Woodrow
of represen-
lered for the
for this sup-
to arrange,
ssion orien-
enefits from

Foreign Area

provide in-
of advanced
earch topics,
nce of these
ers and users
payment to
earch, post-
f specialized
h materials,
s such as the
Tokyo, Uni-
re the cost of
e institution.
0-15 million.
enters of ad-
eral govern-
reign affairs.
private con-
h logical and
base support
ional studies

is infrastruc-
cil on Educa-
the form of a
cedure would
petition, and
three-year in-
visory com-
n is required.
reauthoriza-
Act (IEA), or

creation of a new budget line to be administered by the Department of State. Several participants noted reasons why amendment of NDEA Title VI would not yield good results. In contrast, Section 101 of the IEA is considered perfectly suited to meet this need but requires reauthorization and appropriation. Although other options appear possible, each also has positive and negative consequences. The choice awaits forceful executive department or congressional action.

The second action item for foreign area research is to provide a meaningful national language training program. Mastery of the foreign language is essential to foreign area specialist, even though this means several years of intensive training beyond his or her academic work. For those teaching, those in the conduct of international relations, and for those involved in trade and contact with other nations, language competence is necessary. The educational system of the United States continues to treat this as a minor concern affecting only a small segment of the population. A massive abolition or curtailment of foreign language requirements by institutions of higher education in the late 1960s and early 1970s has exacerbated this problem. A national program is needed to reverse this direction and to stimulate language training.

Annual federal funding of \$20 million is estimated as necessary for a national language program. This would include language centers; support for the intensive training and residence of specialists; development of new teaching methods; broadening of training to other than the classical languages (so as to include Russian, Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, and other less widely spoken languages); retraining of faculty and international affairs specialists; and new arrangements to introduce language training into the professional schools of business, law, etc. The existing legislation of NDEA Title VI appears appropriate, with the purpose of the new funds specifically designated. The significance of this boost can be best seen when it is contrasted with the current appropriation of only \$15 million for both language and area studies centers.

A third action item for foreign affairs research complementary to the second, is the establishment of a Presidential Commission on Foreign Language Training. This action would give recognition to the fundamental and unique role and significance of language training not for a small segment of the population, but for an increasingly large and important segment of the population. The commission should be charged with the conduct of a systematic inquiry into the scope, adequacy, quality, and effectiveness of foreign language training and resources in the United States. It would issue a formal public report on its findings, and perhaps a periodic review of the follow-up to its recommendations and the impact of the foreign language training program previously identified. The commission is not seen as an alternative to the immediate funding of the foreign language program, but